## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

v.

NASHADEEM HENDERSON

**CRIMINAL NO. 17-606-1** 

CIVIL NOS. 21-3821; 22-4181

## **ORDER**

**AND NOW,** this 7th day of August 2024, upon consideration of the pending motions and the responses thereto, it is hereby **ORDERED** that:

- 1. Defendant's Motion for Release of Documents and Motion for Leave to Proceed In Forma Pauperis [Doc. No. 231] is **DISMISSED as moot.**
- 2. Defendant's first Motion to Vacate under § 2255 [Doc. No. 238], second Motion to Vacate under § 2255 [Doc. No. 263], and third Motion to Vacate under § 2255 [Doc. No. 264], Defendant's Motion to Dismiss Counts One, Two, Three and Five [Doc. No. 275], Defendant's Motion for Reduction of Sentence [Doc. No. 276] are **DENIED**.
- 3. A certificate of appealability will not issue as there is no basis for concluding that "reasonable jurists could debate whether . . . the petition should have been resolved in a different manner or that the issues presented were adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed further;"<sup>1</sup>
- 4. The Clerk of the Court is directed to **CLOSE** the cases. It is so **ORDERED.**

**BY THE COURT:** 

/s/ Cynthia M. Rufe

CYNTHIA M. RUFE, J.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000) (internal citation and quotation omitted).